



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY (DOCKET) NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	-----------------------

09/158,938 09/22/98 KARMI

023696  
Qualcomm Incorporated  
Patents Department  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego CA 92121-1714

WM02/0820

EXAMINER  
PEREZ GLUTIERREZ, R

ART. UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
-----------	--------------

DATE MAILED: 08/20/01 19

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/158,938

Applicant(s)  
Karml et al.

Examiner  
Rafael Perez-Gutierrez

Art Unit  
2683



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 21, 2001

2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-124 is/are pending in the application

4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration

5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-124 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirements

## Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on May 21, 2001 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

20) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2683

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Prosecution Application***

1. The request filed on May 21, 2001 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/158,938 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows. **Claims 1-124** are now pending in the present application.

### ***Drawings***

2. The proposed drawing correction filed on May 21, 2001 have been approved by the Examiner.

### ***Response to Amendment***

3. The amendment filed on May 21, 2001 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The amendment to the specification changing "sequence number" to "signature", on page 14 lines 1 and 5, raises a new matter issue because the scope of the invention has been changed completely since this amendment implies that a sequence number is not equivalent to a signature, however, there is no disclosure in the

Art Unit: 2683

present application supporting that a sequence number is not equivalent to a signature.

To support this amendment, Applicant argues, on page 15 lines 16 and 17 of the remarks, that the application, on page 14 lines 18-20, “**explains that the signature is not necessarily equivalent to a sequence number**”.

However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant’s argument because page 14 lines 18-20 of the present application recites that:

*“A signature can be generated by hashing the message is a well-known hashing function to produce a sixteen or thirty-two bit signature”.*

This citation only recites how a signature can be generated, it does not explain how a signature is different from a sequence number as Applicant argues. Moreover, a careful review of the disclosure of the present application revealed that the concept of signature per se, e.g., what is a signature?, has not be defined in the present application. Consequently, Applicant’s amendment to the disclosure is consider to raise a new matter issue because the concept of signature lacks of definition in the present application.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

### *Claim Objections*

4. **Claims 78-94 and 108-124** are objected to because of the following informalities:

a) **Claim 78** recites on line 1 “An **apparatus** as claimed in **claim 1**, ...”, however there is

Art Unit: 2683

no such apparatus in claim 1 because claim 1 recites “A **method** for communicating...”, consequently, either the preamble or the dependency of claim 78 must be change. Same objection applies to **claims 79-94 and 108-124** because they all, directly or indirectly, depend on **claim 1**; and

b) On line 1 of claims 81, 88, 111, and 118, on line 3 of claims 82 and 112, and on line 2 of claims 84, 86, 87, 89, 114, 116, 117, and 119, insert --respective-- before “signature”.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

**Claims 1-124** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Consider **claims 1-124**, and assuming that Applicant’s argument described above is correct (sequence number is not equivalent to signature), the concept of signature has not been clearly defined in the present application in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in

Art Unit: 2683

the relevant art how to make and use the present invention. Since the signature is supposed to be different than a sequence number according to Applicant's argument, the present application must clearly disclose what a signature is, and how such signature is different from a sequence number. Because the disclosure of the present application lacks such definition and differentiation, it is practically impossible to a person of ordinary skill in the art to know how a sequence number is any different than a signature.

Furthermore, Applicant argues, on page 14 last paragraph of the remarks, that a "concept of *signature* as the means for achieving the power and bandwidth savings in the communication systems accessing decentralized network was introduced in the "Summary of Invention" section" on page 7 lines 1-22 of the present application and that the term signature has been consistently use throughout the specification of the present application.

The Examiner absolutely agrees with Applicant's arguments that a concept of signature has been introduced in the "Summary of Invention" section and that the term signature has been use throughout the specification, however, **said introduction and use of the term signature is not providing a proper definition of the concept.** If Applicant considers the signature and the use of the signature to be the novel invention in the present application in view of the prior art (e.g., the sequence number and the use of sequence numbers) then the concept of signature should have been clearly defined in the disclosure of the present application. The present application, by not having a clear definition of the term signature, is left open to interpretation of the term signature to be equivalent to sequence number since the present application also lacks of

Art Unit: 2683

a proper disclosure providing a clear differentiation between signature and sequence number.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

**Claims 78-87, 90, 108-117, and 120** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

**Claim 78** recites the limitation “the message capsule” in **line 1**. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Reference to a message capsule cannot be found in **claims 1 or 78**.

**Claim 81** recites the limitation “the message capsule” in **line 2**. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Reference to a message capsule cannot be found in **claims 1 or 81**.

**Claim 90** recites the limitation “the message capsule” in **line 2**. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Reference to a message capsule cannot be found in **claims 1, 88, or 90**.

**Claim 108** recites the limitation “the message capsule” in **line 1**. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Reference to a message capsule cannot be found in **claims 1 or 108**.

Art Unit: 2683

**Claim 111** recites the limitation “the message capsule” in **line 2**. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Reference to a message capsule cannot be found in **claims 1 or 111**.

**Claim 120** recites the limitation “the message capsule” in **line 2**. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Reference to a message capsule cannot be found in **claims 1, 118, or 120**.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the Examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the Examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).



Art Unit: 2683

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

*Notes to Applicant:*

*a) for purposes of applying prior art and in view of the above remarks in the "Response to Amendment" section the 112 first paragraph rejection, the term signature has been understood as being equivalent to sequence number; and*

*b) for purposes of applying prior art, claims 78, 81, 88, 91, 93, 108, 111, 118, 121, and 123 have been examined as being dependent on **method claim 1**.*

8. **Claims 1-43, 48-58, 62, 63, 65-81, 86-94, and 108-124** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tiedemann, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,392,287)** in view of **Schwendeman (U.S. Patent # 5,396,537)**.

Consider **claims 1, 2, 14, 57, 63, and 65**, Tiedemann, Jr. et al. clearly disclose a method for reducing power consumption in a mobile communications receiver in which a receiver (mobile station) receives a sequence of messages, each respective message containing a

Art Unit: 2683

respective sequence number (signature) generated by a transmitter 10 in a base station (figure 1), and wherein the receiver compares the respective sequence number (signature) of any message with at least one sequence number (signature) (column 8 lines 54-64).

However, Tiedemann, Jr. et al. fail to disclose that the respective sequence number (signature) is separate from the respective message.

Schwendeman clearly discloses a reliable message delivery system utilizing a paging transmitter system in which a message 200, which includes a message capsule 204, that is transmitted to one or more remote units 130 (mobile stations) includes a respective sequence number 208 (signature) (i.e., signature capsule) that is not included in the message 200 (i.e., is separate from the respective message) for purposes of reducing transmission overhead in the paging communication channel 122 (figures 1 and 2 and column 16 lines 38-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to slightly modify the teachings of Tiedemann, Jr. et al. with the teachings of Schwendeman in order to provide an overhead messaging method and system in a wireless communication system in which considerable power can be saved at a mobile station when sequence numbers associated with respective overhead messages are provided separately, thereby allowing a receiving mobile station to be capable of determining if it is necessary to received the overhead message associated with a respective sequence number just by comparing the respective sequence number with a previously received sequence number without the need to go throughout the whole process of receiving the overhead message, consequently, conserving

Art Unit: 2683

power.

Consider **claims 3, 4, 6, 66, and 67**, and as applied to **claims 1, 2, and 65** above, Tiedemann, Jr. et al., as modified by Schwendeman, also disclose that the receiver enters an inactive state (sleeps) if a respective sequence number (signature) received matches a corresponding sequence number (signature) from the at least one sequence number (signature) (column 1 line 63 - column 2 line 4 and column 9 lines 16-20).

Consider **claims 5 and 7**, and as applied to **claims 1-4 and 6** above, Tiedemann, Jr. et al., as modified by Schwendeman, further disclose that the respective message is transmitted during each successive occurrence of the active state (during the inactive state (sleeping)) (column 1 lines 53-60).

Consider **claims 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 62, 68, and 69**, and as applied to **claims 1, 2, and 65** above, Tiedemann, Jr. et al., as modified by Schwendeman, also disclose that the receiver remains in the active state and wait (listen) for a respective message, until the respective message is received, if a respective sequence number (signature) received does not match a corresponding sequence number (signature) from the at least one sequence number (signature) (column 9 lines 10-16).

Consider **claims 10-12, 17-22, 28-30, 33-37, 70-72, and 77**, and as applied to **claims 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 68 and 69** above, although not specifically disclose by the combined teachings Tiedemann, Jr. et al. and Schwendeman, it is inherently taught that the receiver enters the inactive state (sleeps) after the respective message is received (after listening stops, column 9

Art Unit: 2683

lines 16-20) and reenters the active state (wake up) after a predetermined time (e.g., 5.2 seconds) since the time range of the slot cycles disclosed by Tiedemann, Jr. et al. is between 2 and 128 seconds (column 4 lines 4-7).

Consider **claims 23, 24, 31, 32, and 39-42, and as applied to claims 10-12, 17-22, and 28-30 above**, Tiedemann, Jr. et al., as modified by Schwendeman, further disclose that the receiver (mobile station) receives a sequence of messages, each respective message containing a respective sequence number (signature), from a cellular telephone system (wireless communication system) (abstract and column 1 line 53 - column 2 line 5).

Consider **claims 25-27 and 73-76, and as applied to claims 10-12, 17-22, 28-30, and 68 above**, Tiedemann, Jr. et al., as modified by Schwendeman, doesn't specifically disclose listening for a first, second, and third respective message, wherein listening for the third respective message is done after listening for the second respective message, wherein said listening for the second respective message is done after listening for the first respective message.

However, Tiedemann, Jr. et al. does provide a clear teaching that would suggest to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the listening steps of a first, second, and third respective message, as claimed by the Applicant, can be done since Tiedemann, Jr et al. clearly disclose that the respective sequence numbers (signature) of respective messages received at the mobile station are compared with corresponding sequences numbers (signatures) previously stored and if the respective sequence number (signature) of a respective message has changed, the mobile

Art Unit: 2683

station listens to said respective message (column 8 line 54 - column 9 line 20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combined teachings of Tiedemann, Jr. et al. and Schwendeman in order to listen to a respective message having a respective sequence number (signature) that does not match a corresponding sequence number (signature) previously stored and, therefore, saving battery power since only a different message not previously received would be decoded.

Consider **claims 38, 53-56, 78, 91-94, 108, and 121-124**, and as applied to **claims 1 and 42 above**, Tiedemann, Jr. et al., as modified by Schwendeman, further disclose that the sequence of messages are overhead information (i.e., overhead messages, e.g. base station parameters, channel list, access parameters) (column 9 lines 14-16).

Consider **claims 43, 48, 49, 58, 81, 86, 87, 111, 116, and 117**, and as applied to **claim 1 above**, Tiedemann, Jr. et al., as modified by Schwendeman, further disclose the use of a hash function when assigning slot numbers (column 2 lines 48-52), therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combined teachings of Tiedemann, Jr. et al. and Schwendeman in order to use a hashing function when providing sequence numbers (signatures) of sixteen or thirty-two bit value to messages.

Consider **claims 50-52, 88-90, and 118-120**, and as applied to **claim 1 above**, although Tiedemann, Jr. et al., as modified by Schwendeman, doesn't disclose the use of counter when

Art Unit: 2683

giving a sequence number (signature) to a message, the Examiner takes Official Notice that is notoriously well known in the art to use counters when assigning sequence numbers (signatures) to particular sequences of messages.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combined teachings of Tiedemann, Jr. et al. and Schwendeman with well known teachings in the art in order to provide sequence numbers (signatures) to messages using values that are taken from a counter.

**Claims 79, 80, 109, and 110** are similarly rejected for the same reasons explained in detail above for **claims 1, 39, 40, 78, and 108**.

9. **Claims 64 and 95-107** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tiedemann, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,392,287)** in view of **Applicant's admission of prior art**.

Consider **claims 64 and 95**, Tiedemann, Jr. et al. clearly teach a method for reducing power consumption in a mobile communications receiver in which a receiver 122 (mobile station) (figure 3) receives a sequence of messages (message capsule), each respective message containing a respective sequence number (signature) generated by a transmitter 10 in a base station (figure 1), and wherein the receiver compares the respective sequence number (signature) of any message with at least one sequence number (signature) (column 8 lines 54-64).

Tiedemann, Jr et al. also shows that the receiver 122 (mobile station) includes a processor 162 (figure 3). Although, as explained above for **claims 43, 48, 49, 58, 81, 86, 87, 111, 116, and**

Art Unit: 2683

**117**, Tiedemann, Jr et al. disclose the use of a hash function when assigning slot numbers (column 2 lines 48-52), the use of said hash function is done at the base station.

Therefore, Tiedemann, Jr. et al. fail to disclose that the respective sequence number (signature) can be generated or calculated at the receiver (mobile station) from the sequence of messages (message capsule).

Applicant's disclosure clearly admits as being well known the use, at a mobile unit, of a general purpose microprocessor to hash a received message in order to generate a signature (page 14 lines 18-24 and page 9-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the hash function, used by Tiedemann, Jr. et al. in the base station, in the processor 162 of the receiver 122 (mobile station) in order to generate a signature from the received message as recognized by Applicant's disclosure to be well known.

Consider **claim 96**, and as **applied to claims 4 and 95 above**, Tiedemann, Jr. et al., as modified by Applicant's admission of prior art, also disclose that the receiver enters an inactive state (sleeps) if a respective sequence number (signature) received matches a corresponding sequence number (signature) from the at least one sequence number (signature) (column 1 line 63 - column 2 line 4 and column 9 lines 16-20).

Consider **claim 97**, and as **applied to claims 5 and 96 above**, Tiedemann, Jr. et al., as modified by Applicant's admission of prior art, further disclose that the respective message is transmitted during each successive occurrence of the active state (during the inactive state

Art Unit: 2683

(sleeping)) (column 1 lines 53-60).

Consider **claims 98 and 99**, and **as applied to claims 8, 9, and 95 above**, Tiedemann, Jr. et al., as modified by Applicant's admission of prior art, also disclose that the receiver remains in the active state and wait (listen) for a respective message, until the respective message is received, if a respective sequence number (signature) received does not match a corresponding sequence number (signature) from the at least one sequence number (signature) (column 9 lines 10-16).

Consider **claims 100-102 and 107**, and **as applied to claims 10-12, 98, and 99 above**, although not specifically disclose by the combined teachings Tiedemann, Jr. et al. and Applicant's admission of prior art, it is inherently taught that the receiver enters the inactive state (sleeps) after the respective message is received (after listening stops, column 9 lines 16-20) and reenters the active state (wake up) after a predetermined time (e.g., 5.2 seconds) since the time range of the slot cycles disclosed by Tiedemann, Jr. et al. is between 2 and 128 seconds (column 4 lines 4-7).

Consider **claims 103-106**, and **as applied to claims 25-27 and 98 above**, Tiedemann, Jr. et al., as modified by Applicant's admission of prior art, doesn't specifically disclose listening for a first, second, and third respective message, wherein listening for the third respective message is done after listening for the second respective message, wherein said listening for the second respective message is done after listening for the first respective message.

However, Tiedemann, Jr. et al. does provide a clear teaching that would suggest to a



Art Unit: 2683

person of ordinary skill in the art that the listening steps of a first, second, and third respective message, as claimed by the Applicant, can be done since Tiedemann, Jr et al. clearly disclose that the respective sequence numbers (signature) of respective messages received at the mobile station are compared with corresponding sequences numbers (signatures) previously stored and if the respective sequence number (signature) of a respective message has changed, the mobile station listens to said respective message (column 8 line 54 - column 9 line 20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combined teachings of Tiedemann, Jr. et al. and Applicant's admission of prior art in order to listen to a respective message having a respective sequence number (signature) that does not match a corresponding sequence number (signature) previously stored and, therefore, saving battery power since only a different message not previously received would be decoded.

### ***Double Patenting***

10. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention", in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957);

Art Unit: 2683

and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

11. Applicant is advised that should **claims 78-94** be found allowable, **claims 108-124** will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

### ***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-62 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

13. Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (703) 872-9314 or mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Art Unit: 2683

Washington, D.C. 20231

**Hand-delivered responses** should be brought to

Crystal Park II  
2021 Crystal Drive  
Arlington, VA 22202  
Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Rafael Perez-Gutierrez whose telephone number is (703) 308-8996. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, William G. Trost IV can be reached on (703) 308-5318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700 or call customer service at (703) 306-0377.



Rafael Perez-Gutierrez  
R.P.G./rpg

**RAFAEL PEREZ-GUTIERREZ**  
**PATENT EXAMINER**

August 14, 2001



**WILLIAM TROST**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**